



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

only had Benvenuto an immense vocabulary, but he inflected his verbs and varied the other parts of speech with all the profusion of a plebeian to whom *aspettavi* and *aspettavate*, *dentro* and *drento*, *filosafu* and *filosofo*, *stietto* and *schietto*, are pretty much the same.

Notwithstanding the manifold value of Cellini's Life, no good edition of it has existed until this year. We have to thank Signor Orazio Bacci for editing the book in an adequate, I might say conclusive, way. The laborious years which this distinguished scholar required and gave to his task, will not fail to find a reward in the appreciation of all who study Italian literature.

This edition of Cellini is the work of a trained philologist, and has furthermore the merit of being well printed—a rare and gratifying quality in the books of modern Italy; for the land of Aldo Manuzio in this respect lags usually far behind England, the United States and France, in which countries no classic is likely to remain long in shoddy dress. It is a pity that the only good accessible edition of Italy's greatest poet should have had to be printed in England. That the Life of Benvenuto Cellini, after a duration of three hundred and fifty years, may be read at last in an edition at once so scholarly and so pleasing to the eye, is due in the first place to the instigation of Signor Giosuè Carducci. The credit, however, for carrying out the work with such success belongs to Signor Orazio Bacci, and his edition will be appreciated by all the friends of Benvenuto Cellini.

RICHARD HOLBROOK.

Yale University.

SPANISH LITERATURE.

Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, Libro de buen amor. Texte du xiv^e siècle publié pour la première fois avec les leçons des trois manuscrits connus, par JEAN DUCAMIN. Bibliothèque Méridionale, 1^{re} Série, Tome vi. Toulouse: 1901. 8vo, lvi+344 pp.

THE poems of Juan Ruiz, Arcipreste de Hita, were first made accessible to the public in the year 1790 when Tomás Sánchez published them in the fourth and last volume of his *Colección de poesías castellanas anteriores al*

*siglo xv.*¹ This early edition was based on the three extant manuscripts of Juan Ruiz's work, but, as may be judged from the date, the editor did not produce a text suitable for modern critical investigations in regard to language and versification. Furthermore, Sánchez himself tells us that he has

"suprimido una poesía entera y varios pasajes, no los ménos festivos é ingeniosos por no ofender á los que lean estas composiciones, olvidados del fin con que se publican."

In 1863, Amador de los Rios published in his *Historia crítica de la literatura española* the greater portion of those passages which Sánchez had suppressed. Unfortunately, Rios consulted only two of the early manuscripts and it is even possible that he saw only later copies of the original documents.² Thus we are not surprised to find that he failed to discover all the missing passages, and that his text, as published, is by no means free of linguistic errors. In the following year Florencio Janer reprinted Sánchez's text, emending it in the light of but one early manuscript and two later copies of another. Janer also attempted to publish the stanzas not included in the earlier edition, and it seems that he was not familiar with Rios' work on the same subject.

Prof. Jean Ducamin, realizing that the previous editions could not serve as a proper foundation for linguistic study, has prepared a book the aim of which may be set forth in the editor's own words:

Nous avons cru que l'œuvre de l'Arciprêtre était assez importante pour mériter une édition paléographique et une édition critique, et c'est la première que nous offrons aux hispanisants, . . . Les textes de Sánchez et de Janer peuvent, à la rigueur, fournir une base suffisante à une étude littéraire de l'Arciprêtre, mais ils ne sauraient servir aux grammairiens ou aux métriciens pour leurs travaux précis et minutieux. C'est surtout en pensant à eux que nous avons fait notre édition. Nous avons voulu qu'elle pût, autant que possible, leur tenir lieu des manuscrits.

Former editors designated the Arcipreste's work *Poesías* or *Libro de cantares*; Ducamin prefers *Libro de buen amor* which was the title used by the author himself in several instances, adopted by Baist,³ and discussed at

¹ Reprinted by Ochoa, Paris, 1842.

² Cf. Ducamin, p. xlii.

³ *Grundriss der Rom. Phil.*, ii, 2, 405.

length by Menéndez Pidal.⁴ In the present edition the first two chapters of the introduction deal with the manuscripts—their history, contents, size, script, water-marks, etc., and finally the extent to which the documents had been used by previous editors.

The early manuscripts are three in number. The first (**S**) was formerly in Salamanca and is now preserved in the Palace Library in Madrid. The hand-writing is late fourteenth or early fifteenth century, and the text contains, as an introduction, ten stanzas and a lengthy prose passage, neither of which is found in the other early versions. The second manuscript (**G**) belonged formerly to Benito Martínez Goyoso and passed later into the possession of the Spanish Academy. The manuscript was finished July 23, 1389 and some unknown person, "à une époque assez ancienne," underscored, or otherwise marked, certain verses and single words, and Ducamin gives a complete list of these verses and words, and notes that the former are generally proverbs, while the latter were apparently intended for a vocabulary of those expressions which offered special difficulty or interest. The third manuscript (**T**), originally in the Cathedral of Toledo, is now in the National Library in Madrid. The hand-writing is contemporary with that of **G**. In 1899 the manuscript was re-bound, and the binder while trimming the leaves cut into the text in several instances. Fortunately, Ducamin had made his copy in 1897, and thus he has preserved to us the missing letters. **T** and **G** belong to a separate group from that represented by **S**; the order of verses is the same in **G** and **T**, though it differs at times from that in **S**; **G** and **T** show similar errors, and as noted above these two documents were written at about the same time. The book before us contains a facsimile of one page from each of the three manuscripts.

After discussing the sources just mentioned the editor refers to

"un curieux programme ou boniment de jongleur . . . Ce pot pourri de dictons et bouffonneries diverses renferme quelques vers de l'Arciprêtre. Ils sont certainement cités de mémoire et sans le moindre souci de la mesure, ni de leur ordre véritable."

⁴ *Rev. de arch. bib. y mus.*, ii, 1898, pp. 106 ff.

The document is of little value for the study of Juan Ruiz's text, but taken as a whole it throws such a light on the history of the Spanish jongleurs that Ducamin has decided to publish it in full at an early date.⁵

In addition to the manuscripts, there are five "copies" based on sources which are accessible. The first three copies are so closely related that

"Elles semblent prouver qu'à une époque où **S** n'était pas encore connu, antérieurement à Sanchez, en 1753, on avait songé à faire, avec **G** et **T** complétés l'un par l'autre, une édition de l'Arciprêtre."

The fourth copy is based on **S**, and the fifth seems to be simply a reproduction of Sánchez' printed text.

After discussing the various editions of the Arcipreste's work, Ducamin concludes his introduction with three tables. These tables contain, respectively, the comparative numbering of the strophes of his own and Janer's text; a series of parallel columns showing which strophes are contained in the several manuscripts; a comparison of the folios of the manuscript with the pages of the edition.

The editor has taken **S** as the basis for his text, though he uses **G** in order to supply the lacunæ. The reason for selecting **S** as a basis lies in the fact that it is more complete than either **T** or **G**; it is written more carefully and intelligently, and gives, as a rule, the more correct readings, in spite of the somewhat modernized orthography. Furthermore, the spelling in **S** is rather complex, and it was found more convenient to produce this manuscript in full, and give the reading of the other two in the variants. In some cases slight orthographic differences, such as the forms of the letter *s*, are not noted among the variants, but in order that the reader may become familiar with such minor variations, one hundred and thirty-four strophes of **G**, and seventy-seven strophes of **T** are produced *in extenso*.

There are several typographical features of the text which call for special mention. Those portions of the manuscript which are written in red ink are transcribed in heavy type. The editor has reproduced the three scribal forms of the letter *i* (*j*), and has used five distinct

⁵ Cf. Menéndez Pidal. *Cron. gen. de España*, p. 9.

letters in order to render the various forms of the dental sibilant; namely, *ç*, *ç*, *ç*, *ç*, and *s*. The abbreviations have, for the most part, been resolved, and the corresponding letters are put in italics. The horizontal stroke, when used to represent palatalization of the letter *n*, is transcribed as a *tilde* (saña, año), otherwise it is interpreted as *n* (mueran, nonlo). In those cases when the stroke is superfluous, or where its value is doubtful, it has been retained, thus we find such forms as grañd, cieñt, fecho, coño, oñe. I reproduce, herewith, the first two stanzas of the text, omitting the foot-notes corresponding to the numerals 1-4:

Señor¹ dios *que* aloç jodjoç pueblo de perdiçion
facaſte de cabtino del poder de fa[raon]²,
adaniel facaſte del poço de babilon,
faca amj coytaado deſta mala prefion.

Señor tu diſte *gracia* aeſter la Reyna,
antel (*sic*) el rrey afuero ouo tu *gracia* digna:
ſeñor, da me tu *gracia* e tu merced Ayna;
facamez deſta laſeria deſta *prefion*.

It is somewhat difficult to decide when the horizontal stroke over a letter is superfluous, consequently we find the stroke retained in 'nōl,' 'nīl,' but transcribed as *n* in 'conella' (538 d); likewise, we see "con nel (*sic*)" (46 c) in contrast to "conel" (341 b). Indeed it is to be regretted that the editor has not preserved intact all the abbreviations, thereby keeping his text one step nearer the original manuscripts.

While it has been the aim of the present reviewer to give a brief description of the contents and purpose of this new edition, it is impossible to convey an adequate impression of the patience and skill exhibited by the editor in the preparation of the introduction, text, variants, and foot-notes. While the book is intended primarily for the student of language, persons interested in Spanish literature will find welcome material in the seventeen hitherto unpublished stanzas,⁶ and in the *Index de noms propres*. In short, the present edition is an invaluable contribution to our knowledge of Old Spanish, and, although the editor makes no promises, I hope he may supplement the book by a critical study of the text.

6 Nos. 385, and 436-451. See also no. 1656.

In many respects Juan Ruiz is the most important figure of his time, and the publication of the manuscripts of his verses forms an appropriate sequel to Knust's recent study of Juan Manuel, the Arcipreste's famous contemporary.

C. CARROLL MARDEN.

Johns Hopkins University.

LITERARY HISTORY OF AMERICA.

A Literary History of America. By BARRETT WENDELL, Professor of English at Harvard College. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 1900.

THE most striking fact about American literature is its retardation. The earliest colonists came over in the heat of religious and political controversies, and brought with them the Bible—that is, Religion, and the Common Law—that is, Politics. When they had set up (in New England at least) a commonwealth as nearly resembling the old Hebrew theocracy as was possible for Englishmen, and substituted the despotism of the pulpit for the despotism of the throne, they naturally found that politics and religion merged into one. Thus the whole literature (if we can call it literature) of the seventeenth century was theological; re-arguing in heavy prose, or droning in unmelodious verse, the doctrines which had been alive at the beginning of the century. They were out of the world; embayed from all currents of transformation; and the changes that England passed through from James I. to Anne, from Shakespeare to Dryden, practically touched them not. In art and letters the beginning of the eighteenth century found them a hundred years behind.

But the middle of the century saw an advance. America became conscious of itself, and ceased to be a detached piece of England. New England had shaken off the shackles of her rigid theology; and secular politics, the nature and duties of government, and the rights of the people, especially the American people, now occupied men's minds. To this extent the literature was American: in thought it was English, and in expression it modelled itself on the *Spectator*, Swift, and Pope.

The beginning of the nineteenth century saw